

manifest errors of law or fact or to present newly discovered evidence.” *Kurz v. United States*, No. 4:19-CV-310 CAS, 2019 WL 5188976, at *1 (E.D. Mo. 2019) (citations and quotations omitted; unpublished). In the present motion, however, Plaintiff makes no argument that addresses the Court’s finding that her Complaint failed to sufficiently plead any facts to establish federal question jurisdiction. Plaintiff appears to present only arguments regarding the underlying claims she asserted in her Complaint. Moreover, to the extent Plaintiff asserts in her motion that she “state[d] clearly my intention” by marking in the “Nature of Suit” section, “Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations,” it is significant that – as the cover sheet itself states – “the information contained herein neither replace[s] nor supplement[s] the filing and service of pleadings or other papers as required by law.” Plaintiff does not argue – nor does the Complaint reflect – that she otherwise alleged any facts related to or made any claim under RICO in her Complaint. Without sufficient factual pleadings to support such a claim in her Complaint, Plaintiff has not demonstrated that this Court otherwise has federal question jurisdiction. *See Smith ex rel. Van Dalsen v. St. Vincent Infirmary*, 469 Fed. App’x 506, 506-07 (8th Cir. 2012) (affirming the district court’s dismissal of a complaint based, in part, because the plaintiff “alleged no viable basis for federal question jurisdiction” in accordance with the pleading standards of *Ashcroft v. Iqbal*, 556 U.S. 662 (2009); other citations omitted). Nor does Plaintiff’s vague and wholly conclusory reference to a “copyright” in her Complaint, without more, invoke this Court’s federal question jurisdiction.

Therefore, after careful consideration, Plaintiff’s Motion for reconsideration (Doc. 30) is **DENIED**.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

s/ Roseann A. Ketchmark
ROSEANN A. KETCHMARK, JUDGE
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

DATED: August 20, 2021